

numbers, wireless number, pager number, etc.) where the customer can be reached and will keep a record of the number where the customer was reached last time.

Jain describes, at column 2, lines 1-20, that 'The NCP database stores... customer calling number... preferred call set up algorithms, e.g., call me where my last call completed... preferred calling numbers... calling number where the most recent call was completed... in case of emergency ...' Thus, Jain describes a method and apparatus for storing only phone numbers which are used in a predetermined order.

In contrast, claim 1, as amended, now recites "...maintaining a presence context profile for the user, the presence context profile specifying a plurality of communication options for the plurality of presence contexts, *including a plurality of different types of communication devices that are available to the user...*" No such limitation is found in Jain. Accordingly, because no such limitation is found in Jain, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 is overcome and should be withdrawn.

yes Jain does teach

Independent claims 5, 22 and 35 have been amended to include the limitation of claim 1 of the context profile including "... a plurality of different types of communication devices that are available to the user..." and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons put forth above with regard to claim 1.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2, 5-7, 10, 13-15, 19, 22-24, 27, 30-32 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain in view of Bamburak (U.S. Patent 5,197,092).